arXiv:1509.02997v1 [math.RA] 10 Sep 2015

Toward Homological Structure Theory of Semimodules: On Semirings All of Whose Cyclic Semimodules Are Projective

S. N. Il'in[1], Y. Katsov[2], T.G. Nam[3]

Sergey.Ilyin@kpfu.ru; katsov@hanover.edu; tgnam@math.ac.vn;

[1]Lobachevsky Institute of Mathematics and Mechanics

Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, 18, Kremlevskaja St., 420008 Kazan, Tatarstan, Russia

[2]Department of Mathematics

Hanover College, Hanover, IN 47243–0890, USA

[3]Institute of Mathematics, VAST

18 Hoang Quoc Viet, Cau Giay, Hanoi, Vietnam

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce homological structure theory of semirings and CP-semirings—semirings all of whose cyclic semimodules are projective. We completely describe semisimple, Gelfand, subtractive, and anti-bounded, CP-semirings. We give complete characterizations of congruence-simple subtractive and congruence-simple anti-bounded CP-semirings, which solve two earlier open problems for these classes of semirings. We also study in detail the properties of semimodules over Boolean algebras whose endomorphism semirings are CP-semirings; and, as a consequence of this result, we give a complete description of ideal-simple CP-semirings.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classifications: 16Y60, 16D99, 06A12; 18A40, 18G05, 20M18.

Key words: projective semimodules; semisimple semirings; CP-semirings; (congruence-simple, ideal-simple) simple semirings; endomorphism semirings; semilattices.

The third author is supported by Vietnam National Foundation for Science and Technology Development (NAFOSTED) and the Vietnam Institute for Advanced Study in Mathematics (VIASM).

1 Introduction

In the modern homological theory of modules over rings, the results characterizing rings by properties of modules and/or suitable categories of modules over them are of great importance and sustained interest (for a good number of such results one may consult, for example, [34]). Inspired by this, quite a few results related to this genre have been obtained in different nonadditive settings during the last three decades. Just to mention some of these settings, we note that a very valuable collection of numerous interesting results on characterizations of monoids by properties and/or by categories of acts over them, *i.e.*, on so-called *homological classification of monoids*, can be found in a recent handbook [33]; and, for the results on '*homological classification of distributive lattices*,' one may consult the survey [8].

Nowadays, on the other hand, one may clearly notice a growing interest in developing the algebraic theory of semirings and their numerous connections with, and applications in, different branches of mathematics, computer science, quantum physics, and many other areas of science (see, for example, [11] and [9]). As algebraic objects, semirings certainly are the most natural generalization of such (at first glance different) algebraic systems as rings and bounded distributive lattices. Thus, when investigating semirings and their representations one should undoubtedly use methods and techniques of both ring and lattice theories as well as diverse techniques and methods of categorical and universal algebra. Thus, the wide variety of the algebraic techniques involved in studying semirings, and their representations/semimodules, perhaps explains why the research on homological characterization/classification of semirings is still behind that for rings and monoids (for some recent results on '*homological characterization of semirings*,' one may consult [2], [16], [17], [18], [19], [25], [26], [27], [28], [29], [30], [44], and [1]).

In the current and previous [1] our papers, we have studied semirings all of whose cyclic semimodules are projective and injective, so-called *CP*- and *CI-semirings*, respectively. Both these papers, of course, belong to the homological characterization of semirings, but, taking into consideration the additive Yoneda lemma [7, Proposition 1.3.7] (see also [36, Theorem 3.7.1]), the cyclic semimodules permit us to look at the homological characterization from a little bit different perspectives and, to the extend of our knowledge, at the very first time explicitly initiate a new, obviously "bloody" connected with the homological characterization, approach/area — 'homological structure theory (of (semi)rings in our case, for instance)'— (for more detail, please, see Sections 3 and 6). Perhaps this phenomenon can, at least implicitly, explain a persistent interest in studying of cyclic modules over rings (see, *e.g.*, the recent monograph [20]).

Also, ‘congruence- and ideal-simple semirings’ constitutes another booming area in semiring research which has quite interesting and promising applications in various fields, in particular in cryptography [38] (for some relatively recent developments in this area we refer our potential readers to [4], [5], [21], [22], [23], [30], [31], [32], [39], [40], and [45]). In this respect, in the present paper we consider, in the context of CP-semirings, congruence- and ideal-simple semirings as well. The paper is organized as follows.

For the reader’s convenience, all subsequently necessary notions and facts on semirings and semimodules over them are included in Section 2.

In Section 3, we briefly present some “ideological” background of the homological structure theory of (semi)rings (Theorems 3.1, 3.3, and Remark 3.4), establish some important general properties of CP-semirings (Proposition 3.10) as well as the “structural” theorem for CP-semirings (Theorem 3.11), in particular showing that the class of CP-semirings is essentially wider than that of semisimple rings.

In Section 4, among the main results of the paper we single out the following ones: Full descriptions of semisimple CP-semirings (Theorem 4.4), of Gelfand [11, p. 56] CP-semirings (Theorem 4.9), subtractive CP-semirings (Theorem 4.10), and anti-bounded CP-semirings (Theorem 4.16); Full descriptions of congruence-simple subtractive and anti-bounded CP-semirings (Corollary 4.11 and Theorem 4.17, respectively).

Main results of Section 5 are the following ones: Full descriptions of semimodules over Boolean algebras whose endomorphism semirings are CP-semirings (Theorems 5.9 and 5.10); Full descriptions of ideal-simple CP-semirings (Theorem 5.11 and Corollary 5.12).

In conclusive Section 6, we briefly presented, in our view, some interesting and important directions for furthering considerations of this and previous [1] our papers as well as posted a few specific problems.

Finally, all notions and facts of categorical algebra, used here without any comments, can be found in [36]; for notions and facts from semiring and lattice theories, we refer to [11], and [6] (or [10] and [43]), respectively.

2 Preliminaries

Recall [11] that a *semiring* is an algebra $(S, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ such that the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) $(S, +, 0)$ is a commutative monoid with identity element 0;
(2) $(S, \cdot, 1)$ is a monoid with identity element 1;

(3) Multiplication distributes over addition from either side;
(4) $0s = 0 = s0$ for all $s \in S$.

As usual, a *right* S-*semimodule* over the semiring S is a commutative monoid $(M, +, 0_M)$ together with a scalar multiplication $(m, s) \mapsto ms$ from $M \times S$ to M which satisfies the identities $m(ss^{'}) = (ms)s^{'}$, $(m + m^{'})s = ms + m's$, $m(s + s^{'}) = ms + mr^{'}$, $m1 = m$, $0_M s = 0_M = m0$ for all $s, s^{'} \in S$ and $m, m^{'} \in M$.

Left semimodules over S and homomorphisms between semimodules are defined in the standard manner. And, from now on, let $\mathcal{M}$ be the variety of commutative monoids, and $\mathcal{M}_S$ and ${}_S\mathcal{M}$ denote the categories of right and left semimodules, respectively, over a semiring S.

Recall ([25, Definition 3.1]) that the tensor product bifunctor $- \otimes - : \mathcal{M}_S \times {}_S\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ on a right semimodule $A \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$ and a left semimodule $B \in |{}_S\mathcal{M}|$ can be described as the factor monoid F/σ of the free monoid $F \in |\mathcal{M}|$, generated by the Cartesian product $A \times B$, factorized with respect to the congruence σ on F generated by ordered pair having the form

$$\langle (a_1 + a_2, b), (a_1, b) + (a_2, b) \rangle, \langle (a, b_1 + b_2), (a, b_1) + (a, b_2) \rangle, \langle (as, b), (a, sb) \rangle,$$

with $a_1, a_2 \in A$, $b_1, b_2 \in B$ and $s \in S$.

For a right S-semimodule M, we will use the following subsemimodules:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} I^+(M) & := & \{m \in M \,|\, m + m = m\}; \\ Z(M) & := & \{z \in M \mid z + m = m \text{ for some } m \in M\}; \\ V(M) & := & \{m \in M \mid m + m' = 0 \text{ for some } m' \in M\}. \end{array}$$

In the special case when $M = S$ (viewed as a right semimodule over itself), these subsets are (two-side) ideals of S. Also, we denote by $I^{\times}(S)$ the set of all multiplicatively-idempotent elements of S.

A right S-semimodule M is *zeroic* (*zerosumfree, additively idempotent*) if $Z(M) = M$ ($V(M) = 0$, $I^+(M) = M$). In particular, a semiring S is *zeroic* (*zerosumfree, additively idempotent)* if $S_S \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$ is a zeroic (zerosumfree, additively idempotent) semimodule.

A subsemimodule K of a right S-semimodule M is *subtractive* if for all $m, m' \in M$, m and $m + m' \in K$ imply $m' \in K$. A right S-semimodule M is *subtractive* if it has only subtractive subsemimodules. A semiring S is *right subtractive* if S is a subtractive right semimodule over itself.

As usual (see, for example, [11, Ch. 17]), if S is a semiring, then in the category $\mathcal{M}_S$, a *free* (right) semimodule $\sum_{i \in I} S_i, S_i \cong S_S$, $i \in I$, with a basis set I is a direct sum (a coproduct) of I-th copies of S_S. And a *projective* right semimodule in $\mathcal{M}_S$ is just a retract of a free right semimodule. A semimodule M_S is *finitely generated* iff it is a homomorphic image of a free semimodule with a finite basis set. The semimodule M_S is *cyclic* iff it is a homomorphic image of the free semimodule S_S.

Congruences on a right S-semimodule M are defined in the standard manner, and $\operatorname{Cong}(M_S)$ (or, simply by $\operatorname{Cong}(M)$ when S is fixed) denotes the set of all congruences on M_S. This set is non-empty since it always contains at least two congruences—the *diagonal congruence* $\triangle_M := \{(m,m) \mid m \in M\}$ and the *universal congruence* $M^2 := \{(m,n) \mid m,n \in M\}$. Any subsemimodule L of a right S-semimodule M induces a congruence $\equiv_L$ on M, known as the *Bourne congruence*, by setting $m \equiv_L m'$ iff $m+l = m'+l'$ for some $l, l' \in L$.

Following [5], a semiring S is *congruence-simple* if the diagonal, $\triangle_S$, and the universal, S^2, congruences are the only congruences on S; and S is *ideal-simple* if 0 and S are its only ideals. A semiring S is said to be *simple* if it is simultaneously congruence-simple and ideal-simple. Note that in a semiring setting, these notions are not the same (see, *e.g.*, [31, Examples 3.8]) and should be differed.

3 On homological structure theory of semimodules and CP-semirings

Let us consider a category $\mathcal{M}_S$ of the right S-semimodules over a semiring S. Any semimodule $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$ can be naturally considered as an additive functor $M : S \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ from the one object category S to the category of commutative monoids $\mathcal{M}$; and thanks mainly to the additive Yoneda lemma [7, Proposition 1.3.7], the only "representable functor" $\mathcal{M}_S(S_S, -) : \mathcal{M}_S \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_S$, corresponding to the regular right semimodule $S_S \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$, produces the familiar natural (functorial) isomorphism $\mathcal{M}_S(S_S, M) \approx M$ of right S-semimodules. By using this observation, we obtain the following fundamental result of the so-called "*homological structure theory*" of semimodules — representation of semimodules as colimits of diagrams of the regular semimodule S_S — which is an one object additive analog of the colimits of representable functors for set-valued functors (*cf* [36, Theorem 3.7.1] and [7, Proposition 1.3.8]), namely

Theorem 3.1 *Any semimodule $M \in |M_S|$ can be represented (in a canonical way) as a colimit of a functor $D : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_S$ from a small category $\mathcal{C}$ to $\mathcal{M}_S$ that has the regular semimodules S_S as its values on the objects; in short, a semimodule $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$ can be represented (in a canonical way) as a colimit of a diagram of the regular semimodules S_S.*

Proof. Given a semimodule $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$, to construct the needed diagram we first consider the "category of elements," $\mathrm{Elts}(M)$, of M with objects m for each element $m \in M$ and with morphisms $s : m \longrightarrow n$ for those elements $s \in S$ for which $ms = n$. Then, let $\mathcal{C} := \mathrm{Elts}(M)^{op}$ and $D : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_S$ be the functor which sends each object $m \in |\mathcal{C}|$ to the regular semimodule $S_S^m := S_S$ and each morphism $s \in \mathcal{C}(n,m)$ to the induced homomorphism $s^* : S_S^n \longrightarrow S_S^m$. Then, using the natural functor isomorphism $\mathcal{M}_S(S_S, -) \simeq Id_{\mathcal{M}_S}$ and actually word by word repeating the proofs of [36, Theorem 3.7.1] or [7, Proposition 1.3.8] for our "one object additive" case, we obtain that $M = Co\lim D$, *i.e.*, the semimodule M is a colimit of the (small) diagram of the regular semimodules $\{S_S^m, S_S^n \in |\mathcal{M}_S|; s^* : S_S^n \longrightarrow S_S^m \mid m, n \in M, s \in S \text{ and } ms = n\}$. $\square$

Taking into consideration that, for any $m \in M$, the image of the semimodule homomorphism $S_S \longrightarrow M$, given by $1_S \longmapsto m$, is the cyclic subsemimodule $mS \subseteq M_S$ of the semimodule M_S, one can readily rephrase the previous result as

Corollary 3.2 *A semimodule $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$ can be represented (in a canonical way) as a colimit of a diagram of all its cyclic subsemimodules, i.e., of the diagram $\{mS, nS \subseteq M_S; s^* : nS \longrightarrow mS \mid m, n \in M, s \in S$ and the semimodule homomorphism $s^*$is defined by the equation $ms = n\}$.* $\square$

This observation very well explains a strong interest in serious studying of cyclic (semi)modules (for a good collection of very interesting results on cyclic modules we refer a reader to the recent monograph [20]), as well as motivates necessity of a developing of the so-called homological structure theory of semimodules which in the matter of fact is a studying of colimits of diagrams of cyclic semimodules possessing some special important properties, and which we explicitly at the first time initiate in this paper. It is absolutely clear that the homological structure theory of semimodules is very closely connected with the, nowadays widely recognized, homological characterization, or classification, of semirings. Thereby, for example, calling the "canonical" diagram of all cyclic subsemimodules of a semimodule M_S the *full c-diagram* of M_S and the *full injective (projective) c-diagram* of M_S provided that all objects of the full c-diagram of M_S are injective (projective) semimodules, the celebrated characterization of semisimple rings given by B. Osofsky (see, *e.g.*, [35, Theorem 1.2.9], or [34, Corollary 6.47]) and [35, Theorem 1.2.8] can be rephrased as

Theorem 3.3 *The following conditions for a ring S are equivalent:*

(1) The full c-diagram of every module $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$ is injective;

(2) A colimit of the full c-diagram of every module $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$ is an injective module;

(3) The full c-diagram of every module $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$ is projective;

(4) A colimit of the full c-diagram of every module $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$ is a projective module;

(3) S is a classical semisimple ring.

Proof. One only should note that every cyclic (semi)module is always an object of, and a colimit of, its full c-diagram. $\square$

Remark 3.4 However, for semirings in general, the conditions in Theorem 3.3 are not equivalent: Thus, for the semirings $Ext(R)$, introduced in [1], if R is a classical semisimple ring, by [1, Theorem 4.18], (1) of Theorem 3.3 is true, but, by Corollary 3.2 and [18, Theorem 3.4], (2) is not true; Also, for a finite Boolean algebra B with $|B| > 1$, by [1, Theorem 4.3], (1) is true, but, by [**?**, Theorem 3] (see also [8, Section 4]), (2) is not satisfied. Even these observations, for example, obviously open a wide avenue for furthering, from several different perspectives, the homological structure theory of semimodules as well as its "bloody" connection with the homological characterization of semirings.

As was shown in [18, Theorem 3.4] and [16, Theorem 4], respectively, a semiring S is a (classical) semisimple ring iff all right S-semimodules are projective, iff all finitely generated right S-semimodules are projective. In light of this and taking into consideration Theorem 3.3, it is quite natural to consider semirings S with the full projective c-diagrams for every semimodule $M \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$— in other words, semirings S over which all cyclic right (left) semimodules are projective. Thus, in this section, we exactly initiate a study of such semirings, that we call the right (left) *CP-semirings*, and show that the class of CP-semirings is significantly wider than that of semisimple rings. First, the following important observation will prove to be useful.

Proposition 3.5 *A homomorphic image of a right (left) CP-semiring is a right (left) CP-semiring itself.*

Proof. Let S be a right CP-semiring and $\pi : S \longrightarrow T$ a surjective homomorphism of semirings. Then, by [27, Section 4], the surjection π gives the rise to two functors: the *restriction* functor $\pi^{\#} : \mathcal{M}_T \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_S$, defined by $b.s = a\pi(s)$ for any $b \in B \in |\mathcal{M}_T|$ and $s \in S$; and the *extension* functor $\pi_{\#} := - \otimes_S \pi^{\#}T = - \otimes_S T : \mathcal{M}_S \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_T$. Obviously, the restriction functor $\pi^{\#} : \mathcal{M}_T \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_S$ preserves cyclic semimodules. Then, using the natural adjunction $\pi_{\#} : \mathcal{M}_S \rightleftarrows \mathcal{M}_T : \pi^{\#}$ ([27, Proposition 4.1]) and the natural isomorphism of the functors $\pi_{\#}\pi^{\#}$, $Id_{\mathcal{M}_T} : \mathcal{M}_T \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_T$ ([27, Proposition 4.6]), we get that T is a right CP-semiring. $\square$

From this proposition right away follows

Corollary 3.6 *A semiring $S = S_1 \oplus S_2$ is a right (left) CP-semiring iff the semirings S_1 and S_2 are right (left) CP-semiring.*

The following observation is almost obvious.

Lemma 3.7 *If S is a right CP-semiring, then, for every congruence τ on the right S-semimodule $S_S \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$, there exist an idempotent $e \in I^{\times}(S)$ and an S-isomorphism $\psi\colon \overline{S} := S/\tau \to eS$ such that $1\tau e$, $\psi(\overline{1}) = e$, and $p\psi = 1_{\overline{S}}$, where $p\colon S \to \overline{S}$ is the canonical projection.*

Proof. Since the right S-semimodule $\overline{S}$ is projective, there exists an S-monomorphism $\psi\colon \overline{S} \to S$ such that $p\psi = 1_{\overline{S}}$, and let $e = \psi(\overline{1})$. Then, we have $\overline{1} = p\psi(\overline{1}) = p(e) = \overline{e}$, that is, $1\tau e$. Hence, $e = \psi(\overline{1}) = \psi(\overline{e}) = \psi(\overline{1})e = e^2$ and, as ψ is injective, $\overline{S} \cong \psi(\overline{S}) = eS$. □

Lemma 3.8 *If $\equiv_I$ is the Bourne congruence on a right CP-semiring S defined by a right ideal $I_S \subseteq S$, then there exists an idempotent $e \in I^{\times}(S)$ such that $1 \equiv_I e$ and $I \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}_r(e)$.*

Proof. We may assume that the Bourne congruence $\equiv_I$ is not the universal one — otherwise, the statement becomes trivial by taking $e = 0$. Then, $\overline{S} := S/\equiv_I$ is a nonzero semimodule and, by Lemma 3.7, there exists an S-isomorphism $\psi\colon \overline{S} \to eS$ such that $\psi(\overline{1}) = e$ and $1 \equiv_I e$. Clearly, for any $x \in I$, $\overline{1}x = \overline{x} = \overline{0}$, hence, $ex = \psi(\overline{1})x = \psi(\overline{1}x) = \psi(\overline{0}) = 0$, that is, $I \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}_r(e)$. □

Lemma 3.9 *Let S be a right CP-semiring and $\{e_i,\, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ a subset of $I^{\times}(S)$ such that $e_je_i = 0$ for $j > i$. Then, there exists a natural number n such that $e_i = 0$ for all $i > n$.*

Proof. We denote by I the right ideal $\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} e_iS$. By Lemma 3.8, there exists an element $e \in I^{\times}(S)$ such that $1 \equiv_I e$ and $I \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}_r(e)$. Since $1 \equiv_I e$, we have

$$1 + \sum_{k=1}^{m_1} e_{i_k}s_{i_k} = e + \sum_{l=1}^{m_2} e_{j_l}s_{j_l} \tag{1}$$

for some $s_{i_k}, s_{j_l} \in S$, $k = 1, \dots, m_1$, $l = 1, \dots, m_2$. Let $n = \max_{k,l}(i_k, j_l)$. Hence, from our assumption we get that $e_te_{i_k} = 0 = e_te_{j_l}$ for every $t > n$. Whence, multiplying (1) by e_t on left, we have that $e_t = e_te$ and, since $e_t \in I \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}_r(e)$, we have $e_t = e_te_t = e_tee_t = 0$ for all $t > n$. □

Recall (see, for example, [13]) that a commutative monoid $(M, +, 0)$ is called *π-regular* (or epigroup) if every its element has a power in some subgroup of M. Using Clifford representations of commutative inverse monoids (see, for example, [13, Theorem 3.2.1]), it is easy to show that the last condition is equivalent to the condition that for any $x \in M$, there exist a natural number n and an element $y \in M$ such that $nx = nx + y + nx$. A semiring S

is called *additively π-regular* iff its additive reduction $(S,+,0)$ is a π-regular monoid; equivalently, there exist a natural number n and an element $y \in S$ such that $n1 = n1 + y + n1$. Also, let $\diamond$ be the congruence on a semiring S which is defined as follows: $a \diamond b \Longleftrightarrow na = b + x$ and $n'b = a + x'$ for some natural numbers $n, n' \geq 1$ and $x, x' \in S$.

Proposition 3.10 *Let S be a zerosumfree right CP-semiring, $S^{\diamond} := S/\diamond$, and $\theta_+ := \equiv_{I^+(S)}$. Then,*

(1) S is simultaneously a zeroic and additively π-regular semiring;

(2) $S^{\diamond}_S \cong I^+(S) = eS$ for some $e \in I^\times(S)$;

(3) θ_+ is the universal congruence.

Proof. By [19, Lemma 2.2], $S^{\diamond} = S/\diamond$ is a nonzero additively idempotent semiring; and, by Lemma 3.7, there exist an element $e \in I^\times(S)$ and an S-isomorphism $\psi : S^{\diamond}_S \longrightarrow eS$ such that $1 \diamond e$ and $p\psi = 1_{S^{\diamond}}$, where $p\colon S \to S^{\diamond}$ is the canonical projection. In particular, $1 \diamond e$ implies $n1 = e + x$ and $n'e = 1 + x'$ for some $n, n' \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x, x' \in S$. For $S^{\diamond}$ is additively idempotent, $e \in I^+(S)$, we have $e = n'e = 1 + x'$ and

$$n1 = e+x = ne+x+ne = n(1+x')+x+n(1+x') = n1+(nx'+x+nx')+n1.$$

Thus, S is an additively π-regular semiring.

Obviously, $eS = \psi(S^{\diamond}) \subseteq I^+(S)$. Moreover, for each $a \in I^+(S)$, we get that $p(a) \in S^{\diamond} = p(eS)$, and hence, $p(a) = p(b)$ for some $b \in eS$; and hence, $na = b+x$ and $n'b = a+x'$ for some natural numbers $n, n' \geq 1$ and $x, x' \in S$. For a and b are additively idempotent elements, $a = na = b + x$ and $b = n'b = a+x'$. Whence $a = b+x = b+b+x = b+a = a+x'+a = a+x' = b$, and hence, $I^+(S) = eS$.

By Lemma 3.8, there exists an element $f \in I^\times(S)$ such that $1\ \theta_+\ f$ and $I^+(S) = eS \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}_r(f)$. In fact, $f = 0$: Indeed, for some $x' \in I^+(S)$, we have $0 = fe = f(1 + x') = f + fx'$, and, for S is zerosumfree, $f = 0$ and θ_+ is the universal congruence. Finally, $1\ \theta_+\ 0$ implies $1 + a = b$ for some $a, b \in I^+(S)$ and, hence, $1 + z = z$ for $z = a + b$ and, therefore, S is a zeroic semiring. □

Now, applying Proposition 3.5, Corollary 3.6 and [35, Theorem 1.2.8], we conclude this section with the following important result regarding the "structure" of CP-semirings.

Theorem 3.11 *A semiring S is a right (left) CP-semiring iff $S = R \oplus T$, where R and T are a semisimple ring and a zeroic additively π-regular right (left) CP-semiring, respectively.*

Proof. $\Longrightarrow$. Let S be a right CP-semiring, $\equiv_{V(S)}$ the Bourne congruence on S by the ideal $V(S)$. It is clear that $\overline{S} := S/\equiv_{V(S)}$ is a zerosumfree semiring. By Proposition 3.5, $\overline{S}$ is a right CP-semiring, too. Therefore, by Proposition 3.10, $\overline{S}$ is a zeroic additively π-regular semiring. Thus, applying [19, Proposition 2.9], we get $S = R \oplus T$, where R is a ring and T is a semiring isomorphic to $\overline{S}$. Once again, using Proposition 3.5, one sees that the ring R is a right CP-semiring, and hence, by [35, Theorem 1.2.8], R is a semisimple ring.

$\Longleftarrow$. This follows from Corollary 3.6 and [35, Theorem 1.2.8]. $\square$

4 Semisimple, Gelfand, subtractive, and anti-bounded, CP-semirings

In this section, together with some other results, we provide full descriptions of semisimple, Gelfand, subtractive, and anti-bounded, semirings the full c-diagram of every semimodule over which is projective, *i.e.*, the descriptions of semirings of those classes that are also CP-semirings.

A) Let us start with semisimple (semi)rings. First, applying [35, Theorem 1.2.8] and [3, Corollary 21.9], we immediately observe that for a ring R to be a right (left) CP-ring is a Morita invariant property. However, taking into consideration [27, Theorem 5.14], we will see in Proposition 4.2 that is not true for semirings in general. To show that, we will need the following quite useful observation that matrix semirings over a semiring S and the semiring S itself have isomorphic congruence lattices, namely

Theorem 4.1 (*cf.* [41, Theorem 9.1.9]) *Let S be a semiring and $T = M_n(S)$ a matrix semiring over S. For any congruence θ on S, one defines a congruence Θ on T as follows: for any $A = (a_{ij}), B = (b_{ij}) \in T$, $A \; \Theta \; B \iff a_{ij} \; \theta \; b_{ij}$ for all i, j. Then, the map $\chi\colon Cong(S) \ni \theta \mapsto \Theta \in Cong(T)$ is an isomorphism of lattices of congruences, and $T/\Theta \cong M_n(S/\theta)$.*

Proposition 4.2 *Let a semiring S be not a ring, then matrix semirings $M_n(S)$ are not right (left) CP-semirings for any $n \geq 3$.*

Proof. Consider the congruences $\diamond_S$ and $\diamond_T$ on the semirings S and $T = M_n(S)$, respectively, defined as was done before Proposition 3.10. For Theorem 4.1, we readily see that $\diamond_T = \chi(\diamond_S)$, and hence, $T/\diamond_T \cong M_n(S/\diamond_S)$. Then, for Proposition 3.5 and [19, Lemma 2.2] and without loss of generality, one may assume that S is an additively idempotent semiring.

Let $A \in T$ be the matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ such that $a_{ij} = 0$ for $i = j$, and $a_{ij} = 1$ otherwise. It is sufficient to show that the cyclic right T-semimodule AT is not projective. Indeed, suppose that it is not the case, then there exists an injective T-homomorphism $\psi\colon AT \to T$ such that $\alpha\psi = 1_{AT}$, where the surjective T-homomorphism $\alpha : T \longrightarrow AT$ is defined by $\alpha(X) = AX$. Consider the matrix $B = \psi(AE_{11}) \in T$, $B = (b_{ij})$. Since $E_{11}^2 = E_{11}$, we get

$$B = \psi(AE_{11}) = \psi(AE_{11}^2) = \psi(AE_{11})E_{11} = BE_{11}.$$

It implies $b_{ij} = 0$ for all $j \neq 1$. Moreover, $AE_{11} = \alpha\psi(AE_{11}) = \alpha(B) = AB$, and therefore, $0 = (E_{11}A)_{11} = (AB)_{11} = \sum_{i=2}^{n} b_{i1}$. From this and the additive idempotentness of S, it follows that $b_{i1} = 0$ for all $i > 1$.

Finally, $1 = (AE_{11})_{21} = (AB)_{21} = a_{21}b_{11} = b_{11}$. So, $\psi(AE_{11}) = B = E_{11}$. Similarly, $\psi(AE_{ii}) = E_{ii}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. The latter implies $\psi(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi(AE_{ii}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} E_{ii} = E$. It is easy to see that $A(E + E_{12}) = A(E + E_{13})$, hence, $E + E_{12} = \psi(A(E + E_{12})) = \psi(A(E + E_{13})) = E + E_{13}$, what leads us to a contradiction. $\square$

As usual, a semiring S is said to be *right (left) semisimple* if the right (left) regular semimodule is a direct sum of right (left) minimal ideals. As well known (see, for example, [14, Theorem 7.8], or [28, Theorem 4.5]), a semiring S is (right, left) semisimple iff $S \cong M_{n_1}(D_1) \times \ldots \times M_{n_r}(D_r)$, where $M_{n_i}(D_i)$ is the semiring of $n_i \times n_i$-matrices over a division semiring D_i for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Using this observation, in order to describe semisimple CP-semirings, our considerations should be naturally reduced to the ones of the matrix CP-semirings over division semirings; and, therefore, from Proposition 4.2, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 4.3 *A matrix semiring $S = M_n(D)$ over a division semiring D is a right (left) CP-semiring iff D is a division ring, or $D \cong B$ and $n = 1, 2$.*

Proof. $\Longrightarrow$. Let $S = M_n(D)$ be a right CP-semiring. If $n \geq 3$, by Proposition 4.2, D is a ring. Hence, we need to consider only the case with $n = 1, 2$.

Let D be a proper division semiring. Then, the partition $D = \{0\} \cup D\backslash\{0\}$ defines a congruence τ on D. Obviously, $D/\tau \cong \mathbf{B}$; hence, by Theorem 4.1, we have $S/\chi(\tau) \cong M_n(\mathbf{B})$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.7, the right S-semimodule $\overline{S} := S/\chi(\tau)$ is isomorphic to AS via some S-isomorphism ψ such that $\psi(\overline{E}) = A$. Clearly, for any non-zero $d \in D$, we have $Ed\ \chi(\tau)\ E$, hence, $Ad = \psi(\overline{E}d) = \psi(\overline{E}) = A$. Since $A \neq 0$ and D is a division semiring, the equality $Ad = A$ implies $D = \{0, 1\} \cong \mathbf{B}$.

$\Longleftarrow$. If D is a division ring, then S is a semisimple ring, and hence, the statement is trivial. Also, it is clear that $\mathbf{B}$ is a right CP-semiring. Therefore, we need to show only that $M_2(\mathbf{B})$ is a right CP-semiring, too. The proof of [1, Proposition 4.9] serves in our case as well; and just for the reader's convenience, we briefly sketch it here: Namely, we will use the equivalence of the semimodule categories $\mathcal{M}_{M_2(\mathbf{B})}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{B}}$ established in [27, Theorem 5.14]: $F : \mathcal{M}_{M_2(\mathbf{B})} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{B}} : G$, $F(A) = AE_{11}$ and $G(B) = B^n$, where E_{11} is the matrix unit in $M_2(\mathbf{B})$. Let M be a cyclic right $M_2(\mathbf{B})$-semimodule with a surjective $M_2(\mathbf{B})$-homomorphism $f : M_2(\mathbf{B}) \twoheadrightarrow M$. By [29, Lemma 4.7], $F(f) : \mathbf{B}^2 \cong F(M_2(\mathbf{B})) \twoheadrightarrow F(M)$ is a surjective $\mathbf{B}$-homomorphism and, hence, there exists the natural congruence $\equiv_{F(f)}$ on $\mathbf{B}^2_{\mathbf{B}}$ such that $\mathbf{B}^2/ \equiv_{F(f)} \cong F(M)$. It is clear that $\{(0,0)\}$, $\mathbf{B}$, $\{(0,0),(1,0),(1,1)\}$ and $\mathbf{B}^2$ are, up to isomorphism, the only quotient semimodules of $\mathbf{B}^2$ which are projective by [15, Theorem 5.3]. Whence, $F(M)$ is a projective right $\mathbf{B}$-semimodule too, and therefore, using [29, Lemma 4.10], $M \cong G(F(M))$ is a projective right $M_2(\mathbf{B})$-semimodule as well. $\square$

Applying Corollary 3.6 and Proposition 4.3, one immediately obtains a full description of semisimple right (left) CP-semirings, namely

Theorem 4.4 *A semisimple semiring S is a right (left) CP-semiring iff $S \cong S_1 \times \ldots \times S_r$, where every $S_i, i = 1, \ldots, r$, is either an Artinian simple ring, or isomorphic to $M_n(\mathbf{B})$ with $n = 1, 2$.*

B) We say that a semiring S is *right (left) Gelfand* (see also [11, page 56]) if for every element $s \in S$, the element $1 + s$ has a right (left) inverse. In this subsection, we present a full description of Gelfand semirings that simultaneously are CP-semirings. In order to provide this description, we need first to justify the following useful observations.

Lemma 4.5 *Let $I \subseteq S$ be a right ideal of a right Gelfand semiring S. Then, $\equiv_I$ is the universal congruence iff $I = S$.*

Proof. $\Longrightarrow$. Let $\equiv_I$ be the universal congruence. Particularly, we have $1 \equiv_I 0$, that is, $1 + a = b$ for some elements $a, b \in I$. Since S is a right Gelfand semiring, $1 + a$ has a right inverse $c \in S$, therefore, $1 = (1 + a)c = bc \in I$, whence $I = S$.

$\Longleftarrow$. This is obvious. $\square$

Lemma 4.6 *Every right CP- and right Gelfand semiring is an additively idempotent semiring.*

Proof. For a right CP- and right Gelfand semiring S, by Theorem 11, $S = R \oplus T$ where R and T are a semisimple ring and a zeroic semiring, respectively. Denoting by 1_R and 1_T the multiplicative identities of R and S, respectively, we have $1_T = 1 - 1_R$, and hence, 1_T has a right inverse. The latter obviously implies that $T = S$, that is, S is a zeroic semiring. Then, by Proposition 3.10 and Lemma 4.5, $S = I^+(S)$. $\square$

Lemma 4.7 *If S is a right CP- and right Gelfand semiring, then, for any $e, f \in I^\times(S)$, the following statements are true:*

(1) $1 + e = 1$;

(2) $e + f \in I^{\times}(S)$*;*

(3) $eS + fS = (e + f)S$*;*

(4) $eS = fS \Rightarrow e = f$*.*

Proof. (1) As by Lemma 4.6 S is additively idempotent, it is easy to see that $1 + e \in I^{\times}(S)$. The latter, since $1 + e$ has a right inverse, right away implies that $1 + e = 1$.

(2) For (1), $(e + f)^2 = e + ef + fe + f = e(1 + f) + f(1 + e) = e + f$.

(3) Obviously, $(e + f)S \subseteq eS + fS$. On the other hand, $(e + f)e = e + fe = (1 + f)e = e$ and similarly $(e + f)f = f$. Hence, $eS + fS = (e + f)eS + (e + f)fS \subseteq (e + f)S$.

(4) Assume that $eS = fS$. Then, in particular, we get $e = fe$, and hence, $f + e = f + fe = f(1 + e) = f$; similarly, $e + f = e$, and therefore, $e = f$. □

Proposition 4.8 *Let* I *be a right ideal of a right CP- and right Gelfand semiring* S*. Then, there exist elements* $e, f \in I^{\times}(S)$ *such that* $e + f = 1$*,* $ef = fe = 0$*, and* $I = fS$*. In particular,* S *is a right subtractive semiring, and* I *is a direct summand of* S_S*.*

Proof. For $I = S$, or $I = 0$, the statement is trivial, we assume that $I \subset S$ and $I \neq 0$. Then, by Lemma 4.5, the congruence $\equiv_I$ is not universal, and hence, $\overline{S} := S/\equiv_I$ is a non-zero semimodule. Therefore, by Lemma 3.8, there exists an element $e \in I^{\times}(S)$ such that $1 \equiv_I e$ and $I \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}_r(e)$. In particular, we have $1 + a = e + b$ for some $a, b \in I$. Since $1 + a$ has a right inverse $c \in S$, we obtain $1 = (1 + a)c = (e + b)c = ec + bc$; and hence, $e = e(bc + ec) = e^2c + ebc = ec$, since $e \in I^{\times}(S)$ and $bc \in I \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}_r(e)$. So, $1 = ec + bc = e + bc$, and multiplying it by bc on right, one obtains $bc = ebc + (bc)^2 = (bc)^2$, *i.e.*, $bc \in I^{\times}(S)$.

Denoting $bc \in I$ by f, we have $e + f = 1$ and $ef = 0$. Also, $e + f = 1$ implies $x = ex + fx = fx$ for all $x \in I$, so, $I = fS$. Clearly, $f \notin \{0, 1\}$, and hence, $J = eS$ is a right ideal such that $J \subset S$ and $J \neq 0$. Applying the above reasoning to J and keeping in mind Lemma 4.7 (4), one gets $g + e = 1$, $ge = 0$ for some $g \in I^{\times}(S)$. Therefore, $f = (g + e)f = gf + ef = gf = g(f + e) = g$ and $fe = ge = 0$. Thus, the idempotents e and f are mutually orthogonal and, applying the Pierce's decomposition to the regular semimodule S_S, we have $S_S = fS \oplus eS = I \oplus J$.

Finally, for I is a direct summand of S_S, it is subtractive. So, the rest is obvious. □

The following theorem, providing a full description of right Gelfand semirings that are right CP-semirings as well, also solves Problem 2 left open in [1].

Theorem 4.9 *A right (left) Gelfand semiring S is a right (left) CP-semiring iff S is a finite Boolean algebra.*

Proof. $\Longrightarrow$. Assume that S is simultaneously a right CP- and a right Gelfand semiring. By Proposition 4.8 and [28, Theorem 4.4], S is a semisimple right CP-semiring. Then, using Theorem 4.4 and Lemma 4.6, one immediately gets that $S \cong S_1 \times \ldots \times S_r$, where each S_i, $i = 1, \ldots, r$, is isomorphic to $M_n(\mathbf{B})$ and $n = 1, 2$. However, as S is a right Gelfand semiring, each S_i, $i = 1, \ldots, r$, is isomorphic to $\mathbf{B}$, that is, S is a finite Boolean algebra.

$\Longleftarrow$. Let S be a finite Boolean algebra. Then, S is a direct sum of finitely many copies of $\mathbf{B}$. Using Theorem 4.4, one ends the proof. $\square$

C) In the following result, using Theorems 3.11 and 4.9, we obtain a full description of right subtractive right CP-semiring.

Theorem 4.10 *A right (left) subtractive semiring S is a right (left) CP-semiring iff $S = R \oplus T$, where R and T are a semisimple ring and a finite Boolean algebra, respectively.*

Proof. $\Longrightarrow$. Let S be a right subtractive, right CP-semiring. By Theorem 3.11, $S = R \oplus T$, where R and T are a semisimple ring and a zeroic right CP-semiring, respectively. For [28, Lemma 4.7], T is a right subtractive semiring, too. Since by Proposition 3.10 (3), the congruence θ_+ on T is universal, we have $1 \, \theta_+ \, 0$, *i.e.*, $1 + a = b$ for some $a, b \in I^+(T)$. Whence, $1 \in I^+(T)$ since T is right subtractive, and hence, $T = I^+(T)$. Then, for each $x \in T$, we get $1 + (1 + x) = 1 + x$; so, for T is right subtractive, $1 \in (1 + x)T$. Therefore, $1 + x$ has a right inverse in T, that is, T is a right Gelfand semiring. So, applying Theorem 4.9, one sees right away that T is a finite Boolean algebra.

$\Longleftarrow$. Assume that $S = R \oplus T$, where R and T are a semisimple ring and a finite Boolean algebra, respectively. Obviously, R and T are right subtractive semirings; hence, by [28, Lemma 4.7], S is right subtractive, too. Next, using Theorems 3.11 and 4.9, one ends the proof. $\square$

As was mentioned earlier, the concepts of 'congruence-simpleness' and 'ideal-simpleness' for (even for subtractive) semirings are not the same (see, for example, [31, Examples 3.8], or [30, Theorems 3.7 and 4.5]). Also, as were shown in [5, Theorem 14.1] and [30, Corollary 4.4], respectively, for finite commutative and left (right) subtractive semirings, these concepts coincide. As a corollary of Theorem 4.10, our next result, solving [30, Problem 3] and [30, Problem 3], shows that for subtractive semirings these two concepts coincide as well.

Corollary 4.11 *For a right subtractive semiring S, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) S is a congruence-simple right CP-semiring;

(2) S is an ideal-simple right CP-semiring;

(3) $S \cong M_n(D)$ for some division ring D, or $S \cong \mathbf{B}$.

Proof. (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2). This follows immediately from [30, Proposition 4.4].

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3). Assume that S is an ideal-simple right CI-semiring. By Theorem 4.10, S is either a semisimple ring, or a finite Boolean algebra. If S is a semisimple ring, then, since S is ideal-simple, $S \cong M_n(D)$ for some division ring D and $n \geq 1$. Otherwise, S is a finite Boolean algebra. By [30, Theorem 3.7], S is a proper division semiring, and, since S is a finite Boolean algebra, S is just the Boolean semifield $\mathbf{B}$.

(3) $\Longrightarrow$ (1). This follows immediately from Theorem 3.11, Theorem 4.10 and [30, Theorem 4.5]. □

D) Following [1], a semiring S is said to be *anti-bounded* if $S = V(S) \cup \{1 + s \,|\, s \in S\}$. And we conclude the current section with a full description of anti-bounded CP-semirings — what constitutes one of the main results of these section and paper. But first let us consider some important examples of anti-bounded CP-semirings.

Facts 4.12

(1) *The semiring $\mathbf{B}_3$, defined on the chain $0 < 1 < 2$, with the addition $x + y := x \vee y$ and multiplication*

$$xy := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x = 0 \text{ or } y = 0 \\ & \\ x \vee y, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

is a CP-semiring.

(2) The semiring $B(3,1) = (\{0,1,2\}, \oplus, \odot)$ with the operations $a \oplus b \overset{def}{=} \min(2, a+b)$ and $a \odot b \overset{def}{=} \min(2, ab)$ is a CP-semiring.

Proof. (1) As was shown in [1, Fact 4.11], up to isomorphism, there are only two nonzero cyclic $\mathbf{B}_3$-semimodules, namely $\{0, 2\}$ and $\mathbf{B}_3$; and it is easy to see that these semimodules are retracts of the regular semimodule $\mathbf{B}_3$. So, they are projective, and $\mathbf{B}_3$ is a CP-semiring.

(2) This fact can be verified in a similar to (1) fashion. □

For the reader's convenience, we remind here another important class of anti-bounded semirings quite naturally arising from rings and originally introduced in [1, Example 4.16]. Let $R = (R, +, \cdot, e, 1)$ be an arbitrary ring with zero e and unit 1. Let $T := R \cup \{0\}$ and extend the operations on R to T by setting $0 + t = t = t + 0$ and $0 \cdot t = 0 = t \cdot 0$ for all $t \in T$. Clearly, $(T, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ is a zerosumfree semiring. Now, extend the semiring structure on T to a semiring structure on $\mathrm{Ext}(R) := T \cup \{\infty\} = R \cup \{0, \infty\}$, where

$\infty \notin T$, by setting $x + \infty = \infty = \infty + \infty = \infty + x$ and $x \cdot \infty = \infty = \infty \cdot \infty = \infty \cdot x$ for all $x \in R$, and $0 \cdot \infty = 0 = \infty \cdot 0$. It is easy to see that $(\mathrm{Ext}(R), +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ is, indeed, an anti-bounded zerosumfree semiring. In a similar fashion, one can naturally extend the structure of every right R-module M to a structure of an $\mathrm{Ext}(R)$-semimodule on $\mathrm{Ext}(M)$.

Proposition 4.13 *For a ring R, the semiring* $\mathrm{Ext}(R)$ *is a right (left) CP-semiring iff R is a semisimple ring.*

Proof. By [1, Proposition 4.17], up to isomorphism, $\{0\}$, $\{0, \infty\}$, and $\{\mathrm{Ext}(\overline{R}) \mid \overline{R} = R/I\}$, where I is a right ideal of R, are all cyclic right $\mathrm{Ext}(R)$-semimodules. Obviously, $\{0\}$ and $\{0, \infty\}$ are retracts of $Ext(R)_{Ext(R)}$, and hence, they are projective. Also, one may readily verify that a cyclic right R-module M is a retract of R_R iff the cyclic right $Ext(R)$-semimodule $Ext(M)$ is a retract of $Ext(R)_{Ext(R)}$. Using these observations and Theorem 3.3, one ends the proof. $\square$

Proposition 4.14 *A nonzero additively idempotent anti-bounded semiring S is a right (left) CP-semiring iff $S \cong \mathbf{B}$, or $S \cong \mathbf{B}_3$.*

Proof. $\Longrightarrow$. First note that $(S, +)$ is an upper semilattice such that $0 < 1 \leq s$ for any nonzero $s \in S$. Obviously, S is an entire (*i.e.*, has no zero divisors) semiring; and hence, the partition $S = \{0\} \cup S \backslash \{0\}$ defines a congruence τ on S_S. By Lemma 3.7, there exists an S-isomorphism $\psi \colon \overline{S} := S/\tau \to zS$ for some $z \in I^{\times}(S)$ and $\psi(\overline{1}) = z$. Particularly, for every nonzero $a \in S$, we have $\overline{1}a = \overline{1}$, and hence, $za = z$. Clearly, as $z \neq 0$, for some $x \in S$, we get $z = 1 + x \geq 1$ and, therefore, $z = za \geq a$ and $z + a = z$. Thus, z is an infinite element of S. Obviously, if $z = 1$, then $S \cong \mathbf{B}$.

Now consider the remaining case when $z > 1$. Fix $a \in S$ and $a > 1$. Clearly, $a + s \geq a > 1$ for all $s \in S$. Moreover, if $s \neq 0$, then $s = 1 + x$ for some $x \in S$; and hence, $as = a(1 + x) = a + ax \geq a > 1$. Therefore, the partition $S = \{0\} \cup \{1\} \cup S \backslash \{0, 1\}$ defines a congruence σ on S_S. Again, by Lemma 3.7, there exists an injective S-homomorphism $\varphi \colon \tilde{S} := S/\sigma \to S$ such that $\alpha\varphi = 1_{\tilde{S}}$, where $\alpha \colon S \to \tilde{S}$ is the canonical projection. In particular, from the latter it immediately follows that $\varphi(\tilde{1}) = 1$. Then, $\varphi(\tilde{z}) = \varphi(\tilde{1})z = z$. Furthermore, for any $a \in S$, $a > 1$, we have $\tilde{a} = \tilde{z}$, hence, $z = \varphi(\tilde{z}) = \varphi(\tilde{a}) = \varphi(\tilde{1})a = a$. Thus, S has actually only three elements: 0, 1, and z; that is, $S \cong \mathbf{B}_3$.

$\Longleftarrow$. This immediately follows from Facts 4.12 (1) and Theorem 4.4. $\square$

Proposition 4.15 *A zerosumfree anti-bounded semiring S is a right (left) CP-semiring iff $S \cong \mathbf{B}$, or $S \cong \mathbf{B}_3$, or $S \cong B(3,1)$, or $S \cong$* $\mathrm{Ext}(R)$ *for some nonzero semisimple ring R.*

Proof. $\Longrightarrow$. By Proposition 3.5, the quotient semiring $S^{\diamond} = S/\diamond$ is a right CP-semiring as well. Then, since $S^{\diamond}$ is an additively idempotent semiring, by Proposition 4.14, either $S^{\diamond} \cong \mathbf{B}$, or $S \cong \mathbf{B}_3$. Furthermore, by Proposition 3.10 (2), $S^{\diamond}_S \cong I^+(S)$ and, hence, $I^+(S) = \{0, \infty\}$, or $I^+(S) = \{0, e, \infty\}$, and $I^+(S)$ possesses an infinite element. By Proposition 3.10 (3), θ_+ is the universal congruence on S; and therefore, for every $a \in S$, we have $a \ \theta_+ \ 0$ and there exist elements $x, y \in I^+(S)$ such that $a + x = y$. Whence, $a + \infty = a + x + \infty = y + \infty = \infty$. Thus, ∞ is the infinite element of S.

Now suppose that S is not additively regular, that is, $1 + x + 1 \neq 1$ for all $x \in S$. Then, the partition $S = \{0\} \cup \{1\} \cup S \backslash \{0, 1\}$ defines a congruence σ on S_S. Indeed, if $a \notin \{0, 1\}$, then $a = 1 + c$ for some nonzero $c \in S$. It implies $a = 1 + x + 1$ for some $x \in S$. Therefore, for any $s \neq 0$, we get $s = 1 + y$ for suitable $y \in S$; and, hence, $a + s = 1 + x + 1 + s \notin \{0, 1\}$ and $as = a(1+y) = a + ay = 1 + x + 1 + ay \notin \{0, 1\}$. By Lemma 3.7, there exists a S-monomorphism $\psi \colon \overline{S} := S/\sigma \to S$ such that $\alpha\psi = 1_{\overline{S}}$, where $\alpha \colon S \to \overline{S}$ is the canonical projection. In particular, as was shown in the proof of Proposition 4.14, the latter implies $\psi(\overline{1}) = 1$, $\psi(\overline{\infty}) = \psi(\overline{1})\infty = \infty$; so, for any $a \in S \backslash \{0, 1\}$, we have $\overline{a} = \overline{\infty}$ and $\infty = \psi(\overline{\infty}) = \psi(\overline{a}) = \psi(\overline{1})a = a$. Thus, S has, in fact, only three elements: 0, 1, and ∞; and hence, $1+1 = \infty$. Thus, $S \cong B(3, 1)$.

Now suppose S is additively regular. Then, using Clifford representations of commutative inverse monoids (see, for example, [13, Theorem 3.2.1]), the additive reduct $(S, +, 0)$ is a disjoint union of abelian groups $(G_x, +, x)$, $x \in I^+(S)$. Clearly, we have $G_0 = \{0\}$ and $G_\infty = \{\infty\}$. Hence, if $I^+(S) = \{0, \infty\}$, then we get $S = I^+(S) \cong \mathbf{B}$. Finally, if $I^+(S) = \{0, e, \infty\}$, then one may easily see that the subset $R := G_e \subset S$ is closed under addition and multiplication, therefore, $(R, +, \cdot, e, 1)$ is a ring. If R is zero, then $S = I^+(S) \cong \mathbf{B}_3$. Otherwise, one has $S = Ext(R)$ and, therefore, R is a semisimple ring by Proposition 4.13.

$\Longleftarrow$. It follows from Propositions 4.13, 4.14, and Facts 4.12. □

Applying Theorem 3.11 and Proposition 4.15, we have a full description of anti-bounded CP-semirings, namely:

Theorem 4.16 *An anti-bounded semiring S is a right (left) CP-semiring iff S is one of the following semirings:*

(1) S is a semisimple ring;

(2) $S \cong \mathbf{B}$, or $S \cong \mathbf{B}_3$, or $S \cong B(3, 1)$, or $S \cong \mathrm{Ext}(R)$ for some nonzero semisimple ring R;

(3) $S = R \oplus T$, where R is a semisimple ring and T is isomorphic to $\mathbf{B}$, or $\mathbf{B}_3$, or $B(3, 1)$, or $S \cong \mathrm{Ext}(R')$ for some nonzero semisimple ring

R'.

Using Theorem 4.16, it is easy to see that the concepts of congruence-simpleness and ideal-simpleness for anti-bounded right (left) CP-semirings are the same — these semirings are isomorphic either to matrix rings over division rings, or to the Boolean semifield $\mathbf{B}$. In this connection, however, we conclude this section by presenting a more general result characterizing anti-bounded semirings for which these two concepts of simpleness coincide and, therefore, by solving [30, Problem 3] and [31, Problem 5] in the class of anti-bounded semirings.

Theorem 4.17 *For an anti-bounded semiring S the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) S is congruence-simple;

(2) S is ideal-simple;

(3) S is a simple ring, or $S \cong \mathbf{B}$.

Proof. $(1) \Longrightarrow (3)$. Assume that S is a congruence-simple semiring. By [45, Proposition 3.1], S is either a ring, or an additively idempotent semiring. If S is a ring, then since S is congruence-simple we see right away that S is a simple ring.

Now consider the case when S is an additively idempotent semiring, and hence, its additive reduct $(S, +, 0)$ is an upper semilattice with the partial order relation defined for any $x, y \in S$ as $x \leq y \Longleftrightarrow x + y = y$. For S is anti-bounded, $0 < 1 \leq x$ for all $0 \neq x \in S$, and hence, S is entire. Then, there exist the surjective semiring homomorphism $\pi : S \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$ such that $\pi(0) := 0$, and $\pi(x) := 1$ for all nonzero $x \in S$ and the corresponding natural congruence $\equiv_\pi$ on S. Since $(1, 0) \notin \equiv_\pi$ and S is a congruence-simple semiring, $\equiv_\pi$ is the diagonal congruence, and hence, $S \cong \mathbf{B}$.

$(2) \Longrightarrow (3)$. Let S be an ideal-simple semiring. For $V(S)$ is an ideal of S, we have $V(S) = S$, or $V(S) = 0$. If $V(S) = S$, then S is a simple ring.

Now let S be a zerosumfree semiring. Then, one sees right away that $(1+1)S := \{s + s \mid s \in S\}$ is a nonzero ideal of S; and as S is ideal-simple, $(1+1)S = S$, and hence, $s+s = 1$ for some nonzero $s \in S$. Since S is an anti-bounded semiring, there exists an element $x \in S$ such that $1 = 1+x+1+x$, and hence, $0 \neq 1 + x + x \in I^+(S)$. By S is ideal-simple, $I^+(S) = S$, *i.e.*, $(S, +, 0)$ is an upper semilattice with the natural order defined as follows: $\forall\, x, y \in S$ $(x \leq y \Longleftrightarrow x + y = y)$. Then, since $I := \{0\} \cup \{s \in S \mid s > 1\}$ is obviously an ideal of the ideal-simple semiring S, we have that $I = 0$, and therefore, $S = \{0, 1\} \cong \mathbf{B}$.

The implications $(3) \Longrightarrow (1)$ and $(3) \Longrightarrow (2)$ are trivial. □

5 CP-semirings of endomorphisms of semimodules over Boolean algebras

In the previous section, there have been obtained the full descriptions of CP-semirings within widely known and important classes of semirings. In contrast to that, there exists another quite general approach to the problem of describing CP-semirings. As is clear, any semiring S can be considered as a semiring of all endomorphisms $End(M_T)$ of some semimodule $M_T \in |\mathcal{M}_T|$ over a semiring T (for instance, $S \cong End(S_S)$, where $S_S \in |\mathcal{M}_S|$ is a regular right semimodule, of course). Therefore, the following general problem/program sounds quite natural and seems to be very interesting and uneasy as well: Given a semiring T, characterize all semimodules $M_T \in |\mathcal{M}_T|$ such that their endomorphism semirings $End(M_T)$ are CP-semirings. In this section, we initiate this program considering the semiring T to be a Boolean algebra — namely, for an arbitrary Boolean algebra B, we describe all semimodules $M_B \in |\mathcal{M}_B|$ whose endomorphism semirings $End(M_B)$ are CP-semirings. We start with a general observation:

Proposition 5.1 *Let $e \in I^{\times}(S)$ be a nonzero idempotent of a right CP-semiring S. Then, eSe is a right CP-semiring, too.*

Proof. Let S be a right CP-semiring and $0 \neq e \in I^{\times}(S)$. Then, there exist the restriction and induction functors $Res : \mathcal{M}_S \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{eSe}$ and $Ind : \mathcal{M}_{eSe} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_S$, respectively, given by

$$Res(M) = Me, \quad Ind(M) = M \otimes_{eSe} eS.$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that Ind is a left adjoint of Res, and there is a natural bijection $Res \circ Ind \cong Id_{\mathcal{M}_{eSe}}$; and, hence, Ind preserves colimits and Res preserves limits (see, *e.g.*, [36, Theorem 5.5.1]), also one may see that Res preserves finite colimits as well.

Now, let M be a cyclic right eSe-semimodule and $f : eSe \longrightarrow M$ a surjective eSe-homomorphism. It is clear that f is a cokernel of its own kernel pair, and therefore, the S-homomorphism $Ind(f) : eS \cong Ind(eSe) \longrightarrow Ind(M)$ is also a cokernel of its own kernel pair and, hence, surjective, too. For S is a right CP-semiring, the latter implies that the cyclic S-semimodule $Ind(M)$ is projective. Then, since the functor Res preserves finite colimits, it preserves, in particular, the projectiveness of semimodules, and, using the isomorphism $M \cong Res(Ind(M))$, one concludes that the cyclic right eSe-semimodule M is projective and eSe is a right CP-semiring. □

From now on, unless otherwise stated, let $M = (M, +, 0)$ be a right $\mathbf{B}$-semimodule and $S := End(M)$. Obviously, $(M, +, 0)$ is an upper semilattice

$(M, \vee, 0)$ with the least element 0 and the natural order defined as: $a \leq b \Leftrightarrow a + b = b$. For each $m \in M$, let $m^{\triangledown} := \{x \in M : x \leq m\}$, $m^{\vartriangle} := \{x \in M : m \leq x\}$. Also, for any $a, b \in M$, let $e_{a,b}$ be the map from M to M, defined for any $x \in M$ as follows:

$$e_{a,b}(x) := \{ {}^{0 \text{ if } x \leq a,}_{b \text{ otherwise}} \ .$$

It is obvious (also, see [45, Lemma 2.2]) that $e_{a,b} \in S$; moreover, $e_{a,b} \in I^{\times}(S)$ provided $b \notin a^{\triangledown}$.

Lemma 5.2 *If S is a right CP-semiring, then M satisfies the ascending chain condition.*

Proof. Let S be a right CP-semiring, and $x_1 < x_2 < \dots$ an infinite ascending chain in M. Then, the set $\{f_i \in S, \ i \geq 1\}$, where $f_i = e_{x_i, x_{i+1}}$, is a subset of $I^{\times}(S)$. Obviously, $f_i \neq 0$ for each i, and $f_j f_i = 0$ for $j > i$. However, the latter contradicts to Lemma 3.9. $\square$

Lemma 5.3 *If S is a right CP-semiring, then M is a bounded lattice.*

Proof. Obviously, every upper semilattice satisfying the ascending chain condition has the greatest element, hence, by Lemma 5.2, M is a bounded semilattice. Also, it is easy to see that, for every $a, b \in M$, the set $a^{\triangledown} \cap b^{\triangledown}$ is a subsemilattice of M; so, it possesses the greatest element c as well. Clearly, c is the greatest lower bound of a and b, *i.e.*, $c = a \wedge b$. Thus, M is a bounded lattice. $\square$

The following facts, establishing that endomorphism semirings of a *pentagon N_5 or diamond M_3* (see, for instance, [10, p.79]) as well as of a bounded infinite descending chain are not CP-semirings, will prove to be useful.

Fact 5.4 *Let M be a lattice isomorphic to M_3, i.e., $M = \{0, a, b, c, 1\}$, where 0 and 1 are its least and greatest elements, respectively, and a, b, c are mutually incomparable elements. Then, $End(M)$ is not a right CP-semiring.*

Proof. Let $S := End(M)$ and consider the relation θ_0 on S defined for all $s, s' \in S$ as follows: $s \ \theta_0 \ s' \Longleftrightarrow s = ru + v, \ s' = r'u + v$ for some $u, v \in S$ and $r, r' \in \{e_{0,c}, \ e_{0,1}\}$. Then, let θ be the congruence on S_S generated by the relation θ_0, *i.e.*, θ is the transitive closure of θ_0.

Now notice that if $u \neq 0$ and $r \in \{e_{0,c}, \ e_{0,1}\}$, then there exist at least two different elements $x, y \in \{a, b, c\}$ such that $u(x) \neq 0$ and $u(y) \neq 0$: Indeed, if, for instance, $u(a) = u(b) = 0$, then $u(1) = u(a + b) = u(a) + u(b) = 0$ and, consequently, $u = 0$. Thus, we have $u(x) \neq 0$ and $u(y) \neq 0$ and, hence, $ru(x) = ru(y) \neq 0$. From the latter it is easy to see that the unit 1_S cannot be represented in the form $ru+v$ with $r \in \{e_{0,c}, e_{0,1}\}$ and $u \neq 0$. Whence, $1_S\ \theta_0\ s$ implies $1_S = s$, and therefore, $1_S\ \theta\ s$ implies $1_S = s$.

We claim that $\overline{S} := S/\theta$ is not a retract of S_S. Assume that is not a case. Then, by Lemma 3.7, there exists an element $e \in I^{\times}(S)$ such that $\overline{S} \cong eS$ and $1_S\ \theta\ e$. Whence, $1_S = e$, and hence, $\overline{S} \cong eS = S$ and $|\overline{S}| = |S|$. However, since M is finite, so is S, and $|\overline{S}| < |S|$ since $\theta \neq \triangle_S$. Thus, $\overline{S}$ is not a retract of S_S. □

Fact 5.5 *Let M be a lattice isomorphic to N_5, i.e., $M = \{0, a, b, c, 1\}$, where 0 and 1 are its least and greatest elements, respectively, $b < c$, $a+b = a+c = 1$, and $a \wedge b = a \wedge c = 0$. Then, $End(M)$ is not a right CP-semiring.*

Proof. Almost verbatim repeating the proof of Fact 5.4, one only needs to show that the equality $1_S = ru+v$, where $1_S \in S := End(M)$, is impossible when $r \in \{e_{0,c},\, e_{0,1}\}$ and $0 \neq u \in S$. But the latter is almost obvious: Indeed, if $u(a) \neq 0$, then $ru(a) \in \{c, 1\}$ and, hence, $(ru+v)(a) \in \{c, 1\}$ for all $v \in S$, and therefore, $ru+v \neq 1_S$; If $u(a) = 0$, then $a+b = 1$ implies $u(b) \neq 0$, $ru(b) \in \{c, 1\}$, and, therefore, $(ru+v)(b) \in \{c, 1\}$ for any $v \in S$, and one gets again $ru+v \neq 1_S$. □

Fact 5.6 *Let M be a chain $1 = x_0 > x_1 > x_2 > \ldots > x_n > \ldots > 0$. Then, $S := End(M)$ is not a right CP-semiring.*

Proof. Clearly, the partition $M = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty}\{x_{2i}, x_{2i+1}\} \cup \{0\}$ defines a congruence θ on M. For every $s, s' \in S$, let $N(s, s') := \{s(m) \in M : s(m) \neq s'(m)\} \cup \{s'(m) \in M : s(m) \neq s'(m)\}$ and Θ be the relation on S defined for all $m \in M$ and $|N(s, s')| < \infty$ as follows: $s\ \Theta\ s' \Longleftrightarrow s(m)\ \theta\ s'(m)$. Then, for all $s, s', s'' \in S$, one may readily verify all inclusions $N(s, s'') \subseteq N(s, s') \cup N(s', s'')$, $N(ss'', s's'') \subseteq N(s, s')$, and $N(s+s'', s'+s'') \subseteq N(s, s')$. Whence, keeping them in mind, it is easy to see that Θ is a congruence on S_S.

Now we will show that $\overline{S} := S/\Theta$ is not a retract of S_S, and, hence, S is not a right CP-semiring. Indeed, if it is not a case, by Lemma 3.7, there exist $e \in I^{\times}(S)$ and an S-isomorphism $\psi\colon \overline{S} \to eS$ such that $e\ \Theta\ 1$ and $\psi(\overline{1}) = e$. From the latter, $s\ \Theta\ s' \Longleftrightarrow es = es'$. Also, one may see right away that $x_i\ \theta\ x_j \Longleftrightarrow e_{0,x_i}\ \Theta\ e_{0,x_j}$ and, hence, $x_i\ \theta\ x_j \Longleftrightarrow ee_{0,x_i} = ee_{0,x_j}$ $\Longleftrightarrow e(x_i) = e(x_j)$. However, the latter implies $x_i \in N(e, 1)$ for each i; and therefore, $N(e, 1)$ is infinite, what contradicts to $e\ \Theta\ 1$. □

Proposition 5.7 *Let θ be a congruence on M and $\overline{M} := M/\theta$. If $S := End(M)$ is a right CP-semiring, then so is $\overline{S} := End(\overline{M})$.*

Proof. So, let S be a right CP-semiring. First notice that the congruence θ naturally produces the congruence θF on S_S defined as follows:

$$s\ \theta F\ s' \Longleftrightarrow \forall m \in M :\ s(m)\ \theta\ s'(m).$$

Also, $\forall x, y \in M : x \ \theta \ y \Leftrightarrow e_{0,x} \ \theta F \ e_{0,y}$.

By Lemma 3.7, there exists an element $e \in I^{\times}(S)$ such that $S/(\theta F) \cong eS$ and $1 \ \theta F \ e$. By Proposition 5.1, the semiring $R = eSe$ is a right CP-semiring too. So, to complete the proof, it is enough to find a semiring isomorphism $\gamma \colon R \to \overline{S}$.

Let $\alpha \colon M \to \overline{M}$ be the canonical surjection, and $(\gamma(r))(\overline{x}) := \alpha(r(x))$ for every $r \in R$ and $\overline{x} \in \overline{M}$. We shall show that γ actually defines a desired semiring isomorphism $\gamma \colon R \to \overline{S}$.

First of all, as in the proof of Fact 5.6, one may easily see that the following is true: $\forall x, y \in M : x \ \theta \ y \Leftrightarrow e(x) = e(y)$. Hence, for every $r \in R$, the mapping $\gamma(r) \colon \overline{M} \to \overline{M}$ is well-defined. For r and α are homomorphisms, $\gamma(r)$ is an endomorphism, *i.e.*, $\gamma(r) \in \overline{S}$.

Furthermore, for any $\overline{x} \in \overline{M}$ and $r, r' \in R$, we have $[\gamma(r+r')](\overline{x}) = [\alpha(r+r')](x) = \alpha r(x) + \alpha r'(x) = [\gamma(r) + \gamma(r')](\overline{x})$, and hence, $\gamma(r+r') = \gamma(r) + \gamma(r')$; also, we have $\gamma(rr')(\overline{x}) = \alpha(rr')(x) = \gamma(r)(\overline{r'(x)}) = \gamma(r)(\alpha(r'(x))) = \gamma(r)(\gamma(r')(\overline{x})) = (\gamma(r)\gamma(r'))(\overline{x})$, and hence, $\gamma(rr') = \gamma(r)\gamma(r')$; obviously, $\gamma(0) = 0_{\overline{S}}$. So, γ is a semiring homomorphism.

Let $r, r' \in R$ and $r \neq r'$. Then, for some $x \in M$, we have $r(x) \neq r'(x)$. Whence, $(r(x), r'(x)) \notin \theta$ (otherwise, $r(x) = e(r(x)) = e(r'(x)) = r'(x)$); and therefore, $\gamma(r)(\overline{x}) = \alpha(r(x)) \neq \alpha(r(x)) = \gamma(r')(\overline{x})$ and γ is an injection.

Finally, let $\overline{s} \in \overline{S}$ and $\tilde{e}$ be the homomorphism from $\overline{M}$ to M such that $\tilde{e}(\overline{x}) := e(x)$. In particular, $e\tilde{e} = \tilde{e}$; moreover, since $x \ \theta \ e(x)$ for all $x \in M$, we also have $\alpha e = \alpha$ and $\alpha\tilde{e} = 1_{\overline{M}}$. Then, putting $r := \tilde{e}\overline{s}\alpha$, we have $r = ere \in R$ and

$$\gamma(r)(\overline{x}) = \alpha r(x) = \alpha\tilde{e}\overline{s}\alpha(x) = \overline{s}(\overline{x})$$

for every $\overline{x} \in \overline{M}$, hence, $\gamma(r) = \overline{s}$ and γ is a surjection as well. $\square$

Proposition 5.8 *If $S = End(M)$ is a right CP-semiring, then M is a finite distributive lattice.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.3, M is a bounded lattice. Let $L \subseteq M$ be a sublattice and $U(x) := \{a \in L \,|\, x \leq a\}$ for every $x \in M$. Clearly, $U(x)$ is either an empty set, or a sublattice in L. In the latter, let z_x denote its least element if it exists.

First suppose that L is finite and $\phi \colon M \to L$ be the map, defined for every $x \in M$ as follows:

$$\phi(x) := \begin{cases} z_x & \text{if } U(x) \neq \emptyset \\ 1_L & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

One can readily verify that ϕ is a surjective homomorphism and it induces the natural congruence $\sim_\phi$ on M defined for all $x, y \in M$ by formula:

$$x \sim_\phi y \Longleftrightarrow \phi(x) = \phi(y),$$

and $M/{\sim_\phi} \cong L$. From this observation, Proposition 5.7, and Facts 5.4 and 5.5, we conclude that M has no sublattices isomorphic to M_3 or N_5, and therefore, by [6, Theorem IX.2] or [10, Theorem 2.1.1], M is a distributive lattice.

Now let L be a chain $a_0 > a_1 > a_2 > \cdots > a_n > \ldots$ Without loss of generality, we may assume that a_0 is the greatest element of M. Then, $U(x) = L$ or $U(x)$ has the least element for every $x \in M$. Let L' denote the chain from Fact 5.6 and define the surjective homomorphism $\phi\colon M \to L'$ as follows: $\phi(x) := x_k$ when a_k is the least element of $U(x)$, and $\phi(x) := 0_{L'}$ for $U(x) = L$. It induces the natural congruence $\sim_\phi$ on M such that $M/{\sim_\phi} \cong L'$. From the latter, Proposition 5.7 and Fact 5.6, we get that M satisfies the descending chain condition. Using this fact and Lemma 5.2, we get that M has a finite maximal subchain, that is, M is a distributive lattice of a finite length, and therefore (see, for example, [43, Exercises 6, Page 127]), M is finite. $\square$

For the reader's convenience, remind some fundamental concepts and facts regarding the Morita equivalence of semirings from [27] and [29] that we will use in sequence. Thus, two semirings T and S are said to be *Morita equivalent* if the semimodule categories ${}_T\mathcal{M}$ and ${}_S\mathcal{M}$ are equivalent categories, *i.e.*, there exist two additive functors $F : {}_T\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow {}_S\mathcal{M}$ and $G : {}_S\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow {}_T\mathcal{M}$ and natural isomorphisms $\eta : GF \longrightarrow Id_{{}_T\mathcal{M}}$ and $\xi : FG \longrightarrow Id_{{}_S\mathcal{M}}$. Two semirings T and S are Morita equivalent iff the semimodule categories $\mathcal{M}_T$ and $\mathcal{M}_S$ are equivalent categories [29, Theorem 4.12]. A left semimodule ${}_TP \in |{}_T\mathcal{M}|$ is a *generator* in the category ${}_T\mathcal{M}$ if the regular semimodule ${}_TT \in |{}_T\mathcal{M}|$ is a retract of a finite direct sum $\oplus_i P$ of the semimodule ${}_TP$; and a left semimodule ${}_TP \in |{}_T\mathcal{M}|$ is a *progenerator* in ${}_T\mathcal{M}$ if it is a finitely generated projective generator. Finally, two semirings T and S are Morita equivalent iff there exists a progenerator ${}_TP \in |{}_T\mathcal{M}|$ in ${}_T\mathcal{M}$ such that the semirings S and $\mathrm{End}({}_TP)$ are isomorphic [29, Theorem 4.12].

Now let M be a finite distributive lattice. Then, the set

$$T(M) := \{m \in M \mid M = m^{\triangledown} \cup m^{\vartriangle}\}$$

is obviously a chain containing 0 and 1. Also, let $[a, b] := \{x \in M \mid a \leq x \leq b\}$ denote the intervals defined for all $a, b \in M$ and $a \leq b$. We say that an interval $[a, b]$ is *simple* if $[a, b] = \{a, b\}$. Using these notions, our next theorem provides us with a full description of finite distributive lattices whose endomorphism semirings are right CP-semirings.

Theorem 5.9 *For a finite distributive lattice M, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) $End(M)$ is a right CP-semiring;

(2) M/θ is a distributive lattice for any $\theta \in Cong(M)$;

(3) If $t, t' \in T(M)$ and $[t, t']|_{T(M)}$ is simple, then $[t, t']$ is either simple, or isomorphic to $\mathbf{B}^2$.

Proof. (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2). This implication follows immediately from Propositions 5.7 and 5.8.

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (1). Let $S := End(M)$. Since M is a finite distributive lattice, from [15, Theorem 5.3] (or, see, [27, Fact 5.9]) it follows that the semimodule ${}_{\mathbf{B}}M$ is a progenerator in the category ${}_{\mathbf{B}}\mathcal{M}$. Also, by [29, Corollary 3.13], the $\mathbf{B}$-semimodule $M^* := Hom_{\mathbf{B}}(M, \mathbf{B})$ is a progenerator in the category ${}_{\mathbf{B}}\mathcal{M}$, and, using [29, Proposition 3.12], one gets ${}_{\mathbf{B}}M \cong {}_{\mathbf{B}}(M^*)^* := Hom_{\mathbf{B}}(M^*, \mathbf{B})$ and $S \cong End({}_{\mathbf{B}}M^*)$; that is, S is Morita equivalent to $\mathbf{B}$ via the progenerator ${}_{\mathbf{B}}M^*$ in ${}_{\mathbf{B}}\mathcal{M}$. Then, as showed in the proof of [29, Theorem 4.12], the functors $F : \mathcal{M}_S \rightleftarrows \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{B}} : G$, defined by $F(A) = A \otimes_S (M^*)^* \cong A \otimes_S M$ and $G(B) = B \otimes_{\mathbf{B}} M^*$, establish an equivalence between the semimodule categories.

Let A be a cyclic right S-semimodule. Then, there exists a surjective S-homomorphism $f\colon S \to A$. By [29, Lemma 4.7], the homomorphism $F(f) : M \cong F(S) = S \otimes_S M \longrightarrow F(A)$ is surjective in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{B}}$ as well, and hence, there exists a congruence θ on M such that $F(A) \cong M/\theta$. By hypothesis (2), $F(A)$ is a finite distributive lattice; and hence, by [15, Theorem 5.3] (or, see, [27, Fact 5.9]), it is a projective $\mathbf{B}$-semimodule. Applying [29, Lemma 4.10], we obtain that $A \cong G(F(A))$ is a projective right S-semimodule, and therefore, S is a right CP-semiring.

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3). Let $t, t' \in T(M)$ and $[t, t']|_{T(M)}$ is simple. The mapping $\alpha\colon M \to [t, t']$ such that $\alpha(x) := t$ for $x \in t^{\triangledown}$, $\alpha(x) := x$ for $x \in [t, t']$, and $\alpha(x) := t'$ otherwise, obviously is a surjective homomorphism. Whence, $[t, t'] \cong M/\!\sim_\alpha$ for the natural congruence $\sim_\alpha$ on M. It is clear that, if M satisfies (2), then every quotient semimodule of M satisfies (2) as well; so, without loss of generality, we may assume that $M = [t, t']$ and, hence, $T(M) = \{0, 1\}$. We shall show that $M \cong \mathbf{B}$, or $M \cong \mathbf{B}^2$.

For $1 < |M| < \infty$, M has, at least, one atom — a minimal element in $M \backslash \{0\}$. On the other hand, it is easy to see that M has, at most, two atoms: Indeed, if a, b and c are different atoms of M, then, there exists the surjective homomorphism $\phi : M \longrightarrow M_3$ defined as follows: $\phi(0) := 0$, $\phi(a) := a$, $\phi(b) := b$, $\phi(c) := c$, and $\phi(x) := 1$ otherwise, that, since M_3 is not a distributive lattice, contradicts (2). Thus, M has one or two atoms.

Let $a \in M$ be the unique atom. Then, $a \in T(M)$, and therefore, $a = 1$ and $M = \{0, 1\} \cong \mathbf{B}$.

Now consider the remaining case when M has precisely two atoms —

a and b. Then, we have $a \leq c$, or $b \leq c$ for each nonzero $c \in M$ and, therefore, $[0, a+b] = \{0, a, b, a+b\}$ (since otherwise, $\{0, a, b, c, a+b\} \subseteq M$ is a sublattice which is isomorphic to N_5 and M would not be distributive), and consider the following two cases.

If $a+b \in T(M)$, then $a+b = 1$ and $M = [0,1] = [0, a+b] \cong \mathbf{B}^2$.

Finally, suppose $a+b \notin T(M)$. Then, there exists $c \in M$ such that $a+b$ and c are incomparable with each other. Hence, just one of the inequalities $a < c$ and $b < c$ is true, say, for instance, the second one. Without loss of generality, we may also assume that $[b, c]$ is simple. However, one can easily see that in this case there exists the surjective homomorphism $\phi : M \longrightarrow N_5$ defined as follows: $\phi(0) := 0$, $\phi(a) := a$, $\phi(b) := b$, $\phi(c) := c$, and $\phi(x) := 1$ otherwise, that, since N_5 is not a distributive lattice, contradicts (2).

(3) $\Longrightarrow$ (2). Obviously, if a lattice satisfies (3), then its every quotient $\mathbf{B}$-semimodule satisfies (3), too. Also, each lattice satisfying (3) is distributive for it has no sublattices isomorphic to M_3 or N_5. From these observations, we end the proof. $\square$

Our next result, significantly extending Theorem 5.9, gives a full description of semimodules over arbitrary Boolean algebras whose endomorphism semirings are right CP-semirings.

Theorem 5.10 *Let M be a nonzero semimodule over an arbitrary Boolean algebra B, $S := End(M_B)$ and $J := Ann_B(M)$. Then, S is a CP-semiring iff B/J is a finite Boolean algebra and Ma for every atom $a \in B/J$ is a finite distributive lattice satisfying the equivalent conditions of Theorem 5.9.*

Proof. $\Longrightarrow$. Let S be a right CP-semiring, and $\overline{B} := B/J$. One sees right away that M is also a right $\overline{B}$-semimodule and $S \cong End(M_{\overline{B}}) =: \overline{S}$. For S is a right CP-semiring, $\overline{S}$ is a right CP-semiring as well. It is easy to see that $\overline{B}$ is an Boolean algebra, too, and we will show that $|\overline{B}| < \infty$.

Indeed, if $\overline{B}$ is infinite, then, by [42, Theorem 32], it contains a countable set of orthogonal idempotents $\{e_1, e_2, ...\}$. For each e_i, let $\alpha_i : M \longrightarrow M$ be the $\overline{B}$-homomorphism given by the formula $\alpha_i(m) = me_i$. It is clear that each α_i is a nonzero idempotent element in $\overline{S}$ and $\alpha_i\alpha_j = 0$ for all i, j such that $j \neq i$. On the other hand, for $\overline{S}$ is a right CP-semiring and by Lemma 3.9, all but finite number of elements of the family $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \in \boldsymbol{N}}$ should be of zero. Thus, $\overline{B}$ is a finite Boolean algebra.

Let $\{e_1, e_2, ..., e_n\}$ be the set of all atoms of $\overline{B}$. One sees right away that $e_i\overline{B} = \{0, e_i\} \cong \mathbf{B}$ for each i, and $\overline{B} = \overline{B}e_1 \oplus \overline{B}e_2 \oplus ... \oplus \overline{B}e_n$ and $M = Me_1 \oplus Me_2 \oplus ... \oplus Me_n$; moreover, each Me_i is, in fact, a right $e_i\overline{B}$-semimodule. Whence,

$$\overline{S} \cong End(Me_1) \oplus End(Me_2) \oplus ... \oplus End(Me_n).$$

Then, using Corollary 3.6, Proposition 5.8 and Theorem 5.9, one concludes this implication.

$\Longleftarrow$. Taking into consideration that $S \cong End(Me_1) \oplus ... \oplus End(Me_n)$, where each e_i is an atom of $\overline{B}$, and applying Corollary 3.6, Proposition 5.8 and Theorem 5.9, we end the proof. $\square$

From Theorems 4.4, 4.16, and [31, Theorem 5.10], it is easy to see that for a semiring to be 'ideal-simple' and a 'CP-semiring' in general are "independent" properties — there exist both CP-semirings that are ideal-simple and that are not ideal-simple. In light of this, the following applications of Theorem 5.9, completely describing ideal-simple CP-semirings, are certainly of the interest and conclude a list of the central results of the paper.

Theorem 5.11 *For a semiring S, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) S is an ideal-simple right CP-semiring;

(2) S is a simple right CP-semiring;

(3) $S \cong M_n(D)$ for some division ring D, or $S \cong End(M)$, where M is a finite distributive lattice satisfying the equivalent conditions of Theorem 5.9.

Proof. (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2). Assume that S is an ideal-simple right CP-semiring. By Theorem 3.11, S is a semisimple ring, or S is a zeroic right CP-semiring. In the first case, the implication is trivial. So, let S be a zeroic right CP-semiring. By Proposition 3.10, S is additively π-regular, *i.e.*, there exist a natural number $n \geq 1$ and an element $x \in S$ such that $n1 = n1 + x + n1$. For S is a zerosumfree semiring, $(n1 + x) \in S$ is a nonzero additively idempotent element and $I^+(S)$ is a nonzero ideal of S. Whence, $S = I^+(S)$ and, by [12, Proposition 3.4] (or [11, Proposition 23.5]), S can be embedded in some complete semiring. From the latter and [11, Proposition 22.27], it follows that S can be considered as a subsemiring of a semiring T with an infinite element ∞. For S is a right CP-semiring and Lemma 3.7, there exist $e \in I^\times(S)$ and an S-isomorphism $\varphi : \infty S \longrightarrow eS$, with $e = \varphi(\infty)$, and, by Proposition 5.1, eSe is a right CP-semiring, too. Moreover, for each $s \in S$, $ese + e = (es + e)e = (\varphi(\infty)s + \varphi(\infty))e = (\varphi(\infty s) + \varphi(\infty))e = \varphi(\infty s + \infty)e = \varphi(\infty)e = e^2 = e$, and hence, eSe is a Gelfand semiring. And therefore, by Theorem 4.9, eSe is a finite Boolean algebra. On the other hand, by [31, Proposition 5.3], eSe is an ideal-simple semiring as S is ideal-simple; and hence, $eSe \cong \mathbf{B}$. Also, for S is an ideal-simple semiring, we have that $SeS = S$; and therefore, by [31, Proposition 5.2], S is Morita equivalent to $\mathbf{B}$ and, by [31, Theorem 5.6], S is a simple semiring.

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3). Let S be a simple right CP-semiring. By Theorem 3.11, S is a semisimple ring, or S is a zeroic right CP-semiring. In the first case, it is trivial that $S \cong M_n(D)$ for some division ring D. So, let S be

a zeroic right CP-semiring. Let $S^* := Hom_{\mathbb{N}}(S, \mathbf{B})$, then S^* is a right S-semimodule with the scalar multiplication given as: $\phi s(x) := \phi(sx)$ for all $x, s \in S$ and $\phi \in S^*$. Obviously, $(S^*, +, 0)$ is an upper semilattice. For S is also a zerosumfree semiring, the $\mathbb{N}$-homomorphism $\varphi_0 : S \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$, given by $\varphi_0(0) := 0$, and $\varphi_0(x) := 1$ for all $0 \neq x \in S$, is the greatest element in S^*; and let us consider the cyclic right S-semimodule $\varphi_0 S$. By Zorn's lemma, there exists a maximal congruence $\sim$ on the S-semimodule $\varphi_0 S$, and let $M := \varphi_0 S/\sim$. Obviously, the quotient semimodule M has only the trivial congruences. Let N be a subsemimodule of M; then M has only the trivial congruences and the Bourne congruence $\equiv_N$ is either the diagonal congruence, or the universal one. If $\equiv_N$ is the diagonal congruence, then $x \equiv_N 0$ for any $x \in N$ and, hence, $N = 0$. Otherwise, $m \equiv_N m'$ for all $m, m' \in M$; in particular, we have $\overline{\varphi}_0 \equiv_N 0$, *i.e.*, there exist elements $x, y \in N$ such that $\overline{\varphi}_0 = \overline{\varphi}_0 + x = 0 + y = y \in N$, which implies that $N = M$. Therefore, M is a minimal right S-semimodule. Then, for S is a right CP-semiring and Lemma 3.7, there exists $e \in I^{\times}(S)$ such that $eS \cong M$ as right S-semimodules. So, eS is a projective minimal right ideal of S. Whence, by [31, Theorem 5.10], we get that $S \cong End(M)$ for some finite distributive lattice M, and M satisfies the equivalent conditions of Theorem 5.9.

(3) $\Longrightarrow$ (1). This implication follows immediately from Theorems 4.4 and 5.9, and [31, Theorem 5.10]. □

As shown in [45, Examples 3.8(b)], the concepts of 'congruence-simpleness' and 'ideal-simpleness' for finite semirings are not the same. However, it is not a case for CP-semirings:

Corollary 5.12 *For a finite semiring S, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) S is an ideal-simple right CP-semiring;

(2) S is a congruence-simple right CP-semiring;

(3) $S \cong M_n(F)$ for some finite field F, or $S \cong End(M)$, where M is a finite distributive lattice satisfying the equivalent conditions of Theorem 5.9.

Proof. The implications (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) and (3) $\Longrightarrow$ (1) follow from Theorem 5.11.

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3). By Theorem 3.11, S is a finite semisimple ring, or a finite zeroic right CP-semiring. For S is congruence-simple, in the first "scenario," it is clear that $S \cong M_n(F)$ for some finite field F.

Thus, consider the case when S is a finite zeroic right CP-semiring. By [45, Theorem 1.7], there exists a nonzero finite $\mathbf{B}$-semimodule M such that S is a subsemiring of $End(M)$ containing all endomorphisms $e_{x,y}$, $x, y \in M$; and we will show that M is a finite distributive lattice.

Indeed, suppose that L is a sublattice of M isomorphic either to the lattices M_3 or N_5. Then, as was done in the proof of Proposition 5.8, there are the surjective homomorphism $\phi : M \longrightarrow L$ and the natural congruence θ on M such that $\overline{M} := M/\theta \cong L$. And we have (see also Proposition 5.7) the congruence θF on S_S defined as follows:

$$s \; \theta F \; s' \Longleftrightarrow \forall m \in M : \; s(m) \; \theta \; s'(m).$$

For S is a right CP-semiring and Lemma 3.7, there exists an element $e \in I^{\times}(S)$ such that $S/(\theta F) \cong eS$ and $1 \; \theta F \; e$, and, by Proposition 5.1, the semiring $R := eSe$ is a right CP-semiring, too.

Analogously as was done in the proof of Proposition 5.7, one may readily verify that the following is true: $\forall \, x, y \in M : x \; \theta \; y \Leftrightarrow e(x) = e(y)$; $\forall \, x, y \in M : x \, \theta \, e(x)$; the mapping $\gamma : R \longrightarrow End(\overline{M})$, defined as follows: $\gamma(r)(\overline{x}) := \alpha r(x)$ for all $r \in R$ and $\overline{x} \in \overline{M}$, where $\alpha : M \longrightarrow \overline{M}$ is the canonical projection, is an injective homomorphism of semirings. Then, the semiring $\overline{S} := \gamma(R)$ is obviously isomorphic to R and, hence, $\overline{S}$ is a right CP-semiring, too.

Notice that $\overline{m} = \overline{0}$ iff $e(m) = e(0) = 0$ for all $m \in M$. Whence, $\gamma(ee_{0,x}e) = e_{\overline{0},\overline{x}}$, and the semiring $\overline{S}$ contains all endomorphisms $e_{\overline{0},\overline{x}}$ for all $\overline{x} \in \overline{M}$. Now, analogously as was done in the proofs of Fact 5.4, or Fact 5.5, respectively, we have that $\overline{S}$ is not a right CP-semiring. Thus, M is a finite distributive lattice, and, using [45, Proposition 4.9 and Remark 4.10], we obtain that $S = End(M)$ and, by Theorem 5.11, end the proof. □

6 Some conclusive remarks and problems

As was briefly mentioned in Section 3, studying of representations of semimodules over a semiring S as colimits of full c-diagrams of the regular semimodules S_S, in our opinion, constitutes a very interesting and promising and, we believe, innovative area of research — homological structure theory of semirings — having, of course, the "bloody" connections, as was mentioned earlier too, with the homological characterization of semirings as well as with numerous diverse areas of modern algebra, topology and model theory. Therefore, we would be glad to motivate and encourage our potential readers to join us and to further the homological structure theory (of semirings) significantly wider in the following two ways: First, to consider colimits of different types/sorts of diagrams (not only full c-diagrams) whose objects, in turn, are from very well established specified classes of (semi)modules; Second, to develop the homological structure theory in some nonadditive important settings — first of all, such as S-acts (see [33]) and Grothendieck toposes of (pre)sheaves (see [37], or [24]).

Finally, a few, in our view, interesting specific problems closely related to the considerations in this paper.

As was shown in [1, Proposition 4.1], every zerosumfree CI-semiring possesses an infinite element. As to zerosumfree CP-semirings, by Proposition 3.10, they are zeroic; however, all our examples of such semirings are semirings with infinite elements, and we have the following conjecture

Conjecture 6.1. Every zerosumfree CP-semiring possesses an infinite element.

In contrast with the case of rings, the classes of CI-semirings and CP-semirings are different ones (compare, for example, Theorem 4.16 and [1, Theorem 4.20]). Therefore, it would be interesting to see how far the classical result — Theorem 3.3 — of the ring case can be extended for semirings, namely:

Problem 6.2. Describe semirings S such that full c-diagrams of every right (left) semimodule over which are always injective and projective ones.

Also, it would be interesting to see how far the "symmetrical" part of Theorem 3.3 can be extended for semirings, namely:

Problem 6.3. Describe semirings S which are right CP-semirings (CI-semirings) iff they are left CP-semirings (CI-semirings).

Finally, describing CP-semirings (CI-semirings) of endomorphisms of semimodules over various ground semirings S in the spirit of Section 5, in our view, constitutes a quite interesting, promising, and not trivial at all, direction for the furthering research initiated in Section 5, for example:

Problem 6.4. Describe semimodules M over a distributive lattice D whose semiring of endomorphisms $End(M_D)$ are CP-semirings.

References

[1] J. Y. Abuhlail, S. N. Il'in, Y. Katsov, T. G. Nam, On V-Semirings and Semirings all of whose Cyclic Semimodules are Injective, *to appear in Comm. Algebra* (also, see, preprint: arXiv:1406.0590v1).

[2] J. Ahsan, M. Shabir, H.J. Weinert, Characterizations of semirings by P-injective and projective semimodules, *Comm. Algebra*, **26** (1998), 2199–2209.

[3] F. W. Anderson and K. R. Fuller, *Rings and Categories of Modules*, 2nd edn, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1979.

[4] R. El Bashir, J. Hurt, A. Jančařík, and T. Kepka, Simple Commutative Semirings, *J. Algebra*, **236** (2001), 277–306.

[5] R. El Bashir, T. Kepka, Congruence-Simple Semirings, *Semigroup Forum*, **75** (2007), 588–608.

[6] G. Birkhoff, *Lattice Theory*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1967.

[7] F. Borceux, *Handbook of Categorical Algebra 2*, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, 1994.

[8] T. S. Fofanova, Polygons over distributive lattices, in: *Universal Algebra, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai # 29,* North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1982, 289–292.

[9] K. Głazek, *A guide to the literature on semirings and their applications in mathematics and information sciences,* Dordrecht-Boston-London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.

[10] G. Grätzer, George General lattice theory. Second edition, Basel-Boston-Berlin: Birkhäuser Verlag, 1998.

[11] J. S. Golan, *Semirings and their Applications*, Dordrecht-Boston-London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999.

[12] J. S. Golan and H. Wang, On embedding in complete semirings, *Communications in Algebra*, **24**: 9 (1996), 2945–2962.

[13] P. A. Grillet, *Commutative semigroups*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.

[14] U. Hebisch and H. I. Weinert, *Hand book of Algebra, Vol. 1: Semirings and Semifields*, Elsevier-Amsterdam, 1996.

[15] A. Horn, N. Kimura, The category of semilattices, *Algebra Universalis*, **1** (1971), 26–38.

[16] S. N. Il'in, Semirings over Which all Semimodules are Injective (Projective), *Matem. Vestn. Pedvuzov i Univ. Volgo-Vyatsk. Regiona*, **8** (2006), 50–53.

[17] S. N. Il'in, On the Applicability to Semirings of Two Theorems from the Theory of Rings and Modules, *Mathematical Notes*, **83** (2008), 492–499.

[18] S. N. Il'in, Direct Sums of Injective Semimodules and Direct Products of Projective Semimodules Over Semirings, *Russian Mathematics*, **54** (2010), 27–37.

[19] S. N. Il'in, V-semirings, *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, **53** (2012), 222 - 231.

[20] S. K. Jain, Ashish K. Srivastava, Askar A. Tuganbaev, *Cyclic Modules and the Structure of Rings*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2012.

[21] J. Ježek, T. Kepka, The semiring of 1-preserving endomorphisms of a semilattice, *Czechoslovak Math. J.*, **59** (134) (2009), 999–1003

[22] J. Ježek, T. Kepka, M. Maróti, The endomorphism semiring of a semilattice, *Semigroup Forum*, **78** (2009), 21–26.

[23] V. Kala and T. Kepka, A note on finitely generated ideal-simple commutative seimirings, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolon.*, **49** (2008), 1–9.

[24] M. Kashiwara, P. Schapira, *Categories and Sheaves,* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.

[25] Y. Katsov, Tensor products and injective enveloples of semimodules over additively regular semirings, *Algebra Colloquium*, **4** (1997), 121–131.

[26] Y. Katsov, On flat semimodules over semirings, *Algebra Universalis*, **51** (2004), 287–299.

[27] Y. Katsov, Toward homological characterization of semirings: Serre's conjecture and Bass's perfectness in a semiring context, *Algebra Universalis*, **52** (2004), 197–214.

[28] Y. Katsov, T. G. Nam, N. X. Tuyen, On subtractive semisimple semirings, *Algebra Colloquium*, **16** (2009), 415–426.

[29] Y. Katsov and T. G. Nam, Morita Equivalence and Homological Characterization of Semirings, *J. Algebra Appl.*, **10** (2011), 445–473.

[30] Y. Katsov, T. G. Nam, N. X. Tuyen, More on Subtractive Semirings: Simpleness, Perfectness and Related Problems, *Comm. Algebra*, **39** (2011), 4342–4356.

[31] Y. Katsov, T. G. Nam, J. Zumbrägel, On Simpleness of Semirings and Complete Semirings, *J. Algebra Appl.*, **13**: 6 (2014). DOI: 10.1142/S0219498814500157.

[32] A. Kendziorra and J. Zumbrägel, Finite simple additively idempotent semirings, *J. Algebra*, **388** (2013), 43–64.

[33] M. Kilp, U. Knauer, A. V. Mikhalev, *Monoids, Acts and Categories,* Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, 2000.

[34] T. Y. Lam, *Lectures on Modules and Rings,* Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1999.

[35] T. Y. Lam, *A first course in noncommutative rings,* 2nd Ed., Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 2001.

[36] S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1971.

[37] S. Mac Lane, I. Moerdijk, *Sheaves in geometry and logic. A first introduction to topos theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

[38] G. Maze, C. Monico, and J. Rosenthal, Puclic key cryptography based on semigroup actions, *Adv. Math. Commun.*, **1** (2007), 489–507.

[39] Sidney S. Mitchell and Paul B. Fenoglio, Congruence-free commutative semirings, *Semigroup Forum*, **31** (1988), 79–91.

[40] C. Monico, On finite congruence-simple semirings, *J. Algebra*, **271** (2004), 846–854.

[41] J. Rhodes, B. Steinberg, *The q-Theory of Finite Semigroups*, Springer Monogr. Math., Springer, New York, 2009.

[42] V. N. Saliĭ, *Lattices with Unique Complements*, translated from the Russian by G. A. Kandall, Translation edited by Ben Silver, Translations of Mathematical Monographs 69, AMS, Providence, RI, 1988.

[43] L. A. Skornjakov, *Elements of Lattice Theory*, Hindustan Publishing Corporation, Delhi, 1977.

[44] D. Wilding, M. Johnson and M. Kambites, Exact rings and semirings, *J. Algebra*, **388** (2013), 324–337.

[45] J. Zumbrägel, Classification of finite congruence-simple semirings with zero, *J. Algebra Appl.*, **7** (2008), 363–377.